

EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANISATION

of the

I.C.F.T.U.

TRADE UNION CONFERENCE FOR THE REVIVAL OF THE EUROPEAN IDEA.

Brussels, 25 - 27 August 1955

SUMMARY REPORT.

A G E N D A

- 1) Opening speech by the E.R.O. President.
 - 2) General aspects of european integration
rapporteur W. SCHEVENELS
 - 3) Integration of Transport
rapporteur T. TOFAHRN
 - 4) Integration of energy (power)
rapporteur K. OSTERKAMP
 - 5) Integration of atomic energy:
verbal report on the results of
the Geneva conference, by L. ROSENBERG
and K. OSTERKAMP.
 - 6) Setting up of the three following commissions : -
 - a) General aspects of european integration
 - b) Integration of Transport
 - c) Integration of energy (power, including atomic energy)
- August 26th, will be reserved for the meetings of the commissions.
- 7) Report of the commissions (27th August) and general discussion
of their conclusions.

As the case may be, adoption of one or more resolutions.
 - 8) Closing of the conference.

List of Attendance: see Annexe.



First Day - 25 August 1955.

Morning Session.

In the Chair: C.J. CEDDES (Great Britain)

The Chairman, C.J. CEDDES, opened the meeting at 10 a.m., and welcomed the delegates of the National Centres, and especially the representatives of the OEEC, EPA, Council of Europe, International Labour Organisation, the High Authority of the ECSC, the Liaison Office and the Committee of XXI of the European Coal-Steel Community, the Social Attachés to the German, British, Netherlands and U.S. Embassies, the delegates of the International Trade Secretariats of the Building Workers, Clerical Workers and Technicians, Mineworkers, Public Services, Transportworkers, and Metalworkers, and the General Secretary of the ICFTU, J.H. OLDENBROEK.

The Chairman in his introduction, stressed the importance and the tasks of the present Conference, the purpose of which was to make a thorough examination of the practical means to be used by the Trade Union Movement for the Revival of the European Idea, and to create the basis for increased participation in the European intergration projects.

He emphasized the similarity between the Resolutions made by the Ministers of the Community States at Messina and their own Resolutions, but drew attention to a difference in the way in which the aims were formulated. They must give the working class of Europe a new ideal, whilst avoiding any objectives which were not practicable and which would only arouse false hopes. This task called for great efforts and for readiness to make extensive concessions.

The Chairman then turned to the question of procedure. He proposed dealing with Item 2 on the Agenda, and suggested having a discussion on the draft declaration submitted by the General Secretary of the E.P.O., W. SCHEVENELS. He requested the members to send any proposed amendments in writing to the appropriate committees.

The same procedure was applied to items Nos.3, 4 and 5 on the Agenda.

The Chairman then requested appointments of members to sit on the "General Committee", the "Transport Committee" and the "Power Committee".

L. ROSENBERG (Germany) moved the carrying of one single Resolution at the Saturday session.

A. RENARD (Belgium) asked whether the number of committees was sufficient. He thought a fourth commission should be set up to make a thorough examination of the social aspects of integration.

A. GRAEDEL (Switzerland) supported Comrade Renard's proposal in principle, but feared that the setting up of a fourth committee would overload the work of the Conference itself. He therefore suggested that the "General Committee" should make a special point of dealing with the social problems of European integration.

G. PASTORE (Italy - CISL) also agreed with Renard, but he too thought that the study of the social aspects should be left to the "General Committee".

W. SCHEVENELS (ERO) considered this solution satisfactory, but pointed out that the technical and economic aspects of European integration could not be overlooked. It was just on these points that they had to concentrate if they wished to achieve positive results. Needless to say, consideration must also be taken of the social claims of the workers.

A. RENARD (Belgium) stated that specialists were available to deal with the technical and economic aspects, but that the Conference should issue directives regarding the social aspects, as otherwise nobody else in Europe would do so.

The Chairman proposed turning to the question of the social aspects of European integration, in Section V of the Declaration, relative to social problems.

The Conference agreed

The Chairman then requested the General Secretary of the E.R.O., W. SCHEVENELS, to make a statement on the general aspects of European integration.

W. SCHEVENELS began by referring to his written report. In order to save time, he did not intend to repeat the contents of that document, but only to draw attention to the following points. Difficulties and differences of opinion concerning European integration existed in a number of countries, and even they themselves were not exempt. They were aware of the differences of opinion which existed in regard to the Europe of Six, or Seven, of Nine or of Fifteen, as well as the ups and downs which had been experienced in attempts since 1948, to achieve greater co-ordination in various fields. They were also aware of the failure of other integration schemes, such as the Green Pool, for instance. It was claimed that Europe was gradually taking shape, but the present development was far too slow to achieve the desired objective soon enough, and the working class was deriving hardly any benefits at all from this sluggish rate of progress. On the other hand, no progress could be expected from the social viewpoint until the technical and economic problems have been solved. It was therefore essential that the European trade unions should point the way to the practical possibilities now open for a further step on the road to integration.

The Messina Resolution provided for the carrying out of studies, already in progress and whose results would be submitted to a general Conference in October. In order to be in a position to assert the workers' point of view and to act upon the decisions taken by the Minister at that Conference, it was essential that the European Trade Union Movement express its views on these problems without delay. With that view, they had got in touch with P.-H. SFAAK, President of the Committee of Ministers, in order to enable experts appointed by the trade unions, to sit on the general or special committees dealing with these studies. They had also approached the various Governments

insisting on one or more trade union delegates being included in the national delegations. The Council of Ministers had rejected their first demand on the pretext that the committees had so far only drawn up a list of questions, and had not tackled the actual solution of the problems. The question as to whether trade union experts would be included in the national delegations was still hanging.

There was then the question as to how they should proceed on the national and international level, in order to collaborate and carry out the Governmental projects at present envisaged regarding transport and power. They had, above all, to arouse public opinion in regard to those problems. They had to appeal to that class of the population which best realised the necessity of European integration namely, the working class.

W. SCHEFFELS stressed the immense importance of forming a common market in Europe. They must therefore make every effort to oppose any resistance in each country, so as to make a start with the projects elaborated by the Messina Conference. Once the Governments had got going, the time would come for them to put forward the workers' claims.

The speaker went on to tackle the question as to whether they should aim at general integration, or whether they should concentrate on partial integration pending favourable circumstances later on when they could get to work on general integration. They had to realise that partial integration involved certain risks, as if they remained isolated for too long a period, the inevitable consequence would be that other sections of the economy would disintegrate. The Messina Resolution, apart from the partial integration of transport and power provided for the gradual creation of a common market for all products. If that could be accomplished it would doubtless be the better solution. The difficulties in that field were so great, however, that the obvious question arose as to how far the Messina Governments took the latter proposal seriously.

Nor had the question been settled as to what form the partial integration of transport and power should take. Comrade Tofahrn would later on, throw some light on to the way in which the Governments were using their transport system as a means for the economic war. The Governments now had an opportunity therefore to prove that they were prepared to cease the economic war they were waging against each other and to work sincerely for European unification, as the necessary technical conditions were certainly available to permit a rapid integration of European transport.

It was no longer necessary to emphasize the necessity and urgency of forming a common market for Europe for her future evolution. Each day that passed by unused, only increased their state of inferiority compared with the two other economic blocks. They must not allow their present opportunity to exercise influence on the preparatory measures for creating a common European market, the transport community, the power community and the development of atomic energy, to escape them.

A. RENARD (F. G. T. B. - Belgium) did not consider the present status of the Coal and Steel Community satisfactory. The ECSC appeared quietly to be turning into a cartel. In its present form the ECSC Treaty seemed to be an obstacle in the way of real European collaboration. Nor had Messina negotiations achieved the expected results, although use could be made of Articles II and III of the Resolution on the raising of the living standard. In order to enable those principles to materialise, the Free Trade Union had to concentrate their common efforts in that direction, with the accent on the social aspect of the integration policy. It was not the trade unions' task to organise the economy of a country, but it was their duty to submit claims likely to exert influence on the economy.

The blame for the present failure of international discussions lay with national egoism. As for the Free Trade Unions, they had to be prepared to take the risks involved in integration provided they were consulted on social matters. Without the certainty of international solidarity on the part of the Free Trade Unions, however, the chances of success were zero.

L. ROSENBERG (DGB-Germany) agreed with A. Renard that social integration could not be separated from economic integration. Consequently, the Free Trade Unions must have greater participation in the economic development of the new Europe than in the past. Trade union claims could be implemented once the trade unions were in a position to exercise the necessary influence on their Governments. On the European level the international solidarity of the national trade unions was of importance in that connection.

Speaker could not help feeling, however, that what they wanted was a Europe which would not bring advantages to some States at the expense of others. Hence the expedient in the form of functional integration. For the same reason the ECSC had so far not secured the necessary powers enabling it to act as a true High Authority or supra-national Authority, the result being that the tasks which really should be assigned to the High Authority, were handled by an international private cartel in that sense.

Likewise with the trade unions, where it was not possible to separate the national interests from the international interests. So long as there was no realistic European conception, the trade unions would continue to hobble along behind the policy of the individual States.

L. Rosenberg then spoke about the problem of partial integration and the necessity of securing greater participation of the trade unions in all the negotiations on integration at Governmental level. Above all, the trade unions must not become the slaves of the national economic policy, and must not support the latter if it ran counter to their trade union policy at international level.

T. YATES (Great Britain) pointed out that the United Kingdom was in a particular position as a result of Britain's responsibility towards the Commonwealth and the Sterling Zone in general. Regarding

the immigration of foreign workers to Great Britain, Comrade Yates stated that 364,000 foreign workers had been given working permits between 1947 and 1954. In addition, about one million Irish workers were employed in the U.K.

Referring to Britain's relations with the European Coal and Steel Community, Comrade Yates recalled the recent meeting in London where attempts had been made to find a basis for closer co-operation. Personally, he could have no confidence in the idea of a supra-national authority aimed at the political integration of Europe. The British delegation could not agree to some of the political objectives contained in the draft declaration submitted to the Conference. In the first place, there would have to be closer co-operation between the European countries, which would enable political integration to be achieved slowly and gradually. The British delegation could not accept all the points in the declaration submitted, and would put forward alternative proposals in writing.

CH. VEILLON (F.O.- Franco) regretted that some European integration attempts, such as the Green Pool, for instance, had suffered setbacks, and said he agreed entirely with Comrade RENARD's conclusions concerning the Coal and Steel Community. Comrade Veillon gave warning of the danger facing many countries, if by removing Customs restrictions there should be a return of free competition within the framework of a capitalistic economy, based on the inferior working conditions of certain countries. It was their task to seek the means for adapting these working conditions to each other, and for ensuring and improving the living standard of the working masses.

The Governments appeared now to be more disposed to agree to the common use of sources of energy and means of transport. True, the trade unions must also take part in dealing with the technical problems but it was particularly important that they should deal with the social aspects involved. The Resolution adopted at the present Conference should not only define their claims to the Governments in that connection, but should also make a special point of winning over the greatest possible section of the population to the aims of their Trade Union International.

The CHAIRMAN adjourned the meeting at 1 p.m.

Afternoon Session - 25th August 1955.

The CHAIRMAN opened the meeting at 3 p.m., and called upon Comrade H. OOSTERHUIS to speak.

H. OOSTERHUIS (NVV, Netherlands) agreed in principle with W. SCHEVENELS as regards the general aspects of European integration and the setting up of a common market. He stated that the Dutch trade unions preferred collaboration on a supra-national than on an inter-State basis. Integration in the field of atomic energy must, above all, be achieved under a supra-national authority. In order to secure

closer collaboration between all the sectors of the economy it would be indispensable to set up a High Council to co-ordinate the activities of the various supra-national communities.

He did not think it would be possible to harmonise the social conditions before the various countries of Europe had been economically integrated. This did not mean, however, that the Dutch comrades were against greater harmonisation of the working conditions in the various countries. They believed that the Trade Union Movement should participate at all levels in all discussions on European integration. For that reason they considered supra-national integration the best solution, as it would ensure the complete development of trade union influence in the bodies created for that effect.

G. PASTORE (CISL, Italy), stated the present economic and social problems of Europe could only be solved through integration. Integration confined to certain sectors only could in any case, not solve Europe's most difficult problems. It was therefore necessary to set up a common market, liberalise trade and facilitate free mobility of capital and manpower. They must approach their Governments and insist on Labour representatives taking part in all discussions which took place after the Messina Conference. They must be prepared to grapple successfully with the difficulties which would be placed before them by other groups of interests no doubt, and provide proof that the Trade Union Movement was unanimously in favour of the integration of Europe. At the same time, they could not oppose technical progress which alone could improve the living conditions of the workers, subject to proper supervision on their part.

Comrade Pastore expressed doubts as to Comrade Renard's view that the trade union rôle in connection with European integration should be confined to making claims, as there was the risk of their having to trail behind the capitalists to whom it would be left to build the new Europe. As he saw it, they should establish precise objectives and act as pioneers in the entire process of unifying Europe, and not sit back and wait for initiatives of the Governments or other groups.

Speaker closed his speech by saying that the progressive integration of all sectors of the economy and the setting up of a supra-national authority was an indispensable task. Europe would thus play a decisive rôle on the economic and social level and for the defence of peace.

A. GRAEDEL (Switzerland - USS) considered Comrade W. Schevenels' statement very constructive. Integration would take place with or without the trade unions, and that being so, the Trade Union Movement could in no case stand aside. The Resolution should emphasize the fact that the Free Trade Unions deem economic integration essential, but that did not amount to their unconditional agreement. The Free Trade Unions insisted on obtaining the necessary guarantees in the social field. The important thing was for them not to be too late, but to exercise their influence before the Governments elaborated the form of the integration institutions.

In conclusion, Comrade Graedel insisted that the trade unions should be given assurances guaranteeing their rights and their autonomy. They did not want any legislation on labour conditions elaborated by a supra-national authority which would restrict the trade union powers.

J.H. OLDENBROEK (General Secretary, ICFU) stated that there was no need for the trade unions to discuss the merits of the European Idea, and thought that they would give their enthusiastic support to the carrying out of the aims proposed by the Conference. He was disappointed that the discussion had so far, not led to any general agreement as to the ways and means for putting the unification of Europe into effect. He reminded the meeting that already in 1947, Europe had been rescued by the Marshall Plan, even though this aid had not always been used for the benefit of the European Idea. Now that international tension was decreasing and that ideological differences were not causing such disturbances to international relations, the time had come to ask what was to be the fate of the working class of Europe. They had to realise the importance of the decisions they had to take. They must not forget that if they were not in a position to further European collaboration in the fields of production and distribution, they would be incapable of making any progress at all, and they would never have security. Another point to be considered by the Conference, was that of the social improvements which should result from integration measures.

For years, the Government had toyed with the European Idea, and had continually made promises which had not been kept. It was therefore indispensable that all the democratic forces of Europe unite, even if it meant collaborating with the Employers, in order to achieve that objective. They must do everything possible to get the Governments to act on their lines. No longer was it a question as to whether European integration were technically possible. It was necessary! If they did not succeed in convincing everybody of this necessity it would soon be too late! So far, they had always been backward and had done too little. If they did not act now, the workers of Europe would hold them responsible later on.

W. SCHEVENELS (ERO) agreed with Comrade Oldenbrook's remarks, and added that they must not allow themselves to become pessimistic, but must view the enormous task facing them with confidence and optimism. They must do everything possible to win over all the progressive powers of Europe to this task.

They knew that there were some countries which did not consider European unification to be so very urgent for themselves, and that they had obligations towards other communities. They ought to discuss the matter with their friends who represented these countries, and get them to understand the imperious necessity for them to join in with the others in order to make Europe strong and enable her to play her rôle of pioneer in social progress. Those countries would then be able to fulfil their tasks in the other communities in a more fruitful manner. Were Europe to perish, the countries in question would be incapable of helping themselves, and they must not forget that.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to pass on to Item N°3 on the Agenda, and requested Comrade Tofahrn, delegate of the International Transport

Workers Federation, to take the floor.

P. TOFAHRN (I. T. F.) was pleased to note that according to what he had heard, the ITF could rely on support for its integration efforts. It was not enough, however, just to have the majority; they needed unanimous agreement as regards a European transport community. There were a number of organisations in the transport sector, and that alone showed the necessity of closer international collaboration. There would be difficulties if some countries kept apart. The transport sector was rich in conflicts and one had only to think of the competition between the various ports. The various Governments supported their own enterprise by manipulating the railway tariffs and freight rates, as well as the prices of fuel, etc., and all that had serious results for the workers. The uneconomic character of the national organisations was intensified by competition which led to an over-capacity of the transport system. This meant considerable deficits and excessive transport costs at the expense of the consumers and taxpayers, leading finally to a worsening of the trade unions' position when conducting wage negotiations and to the risk of worsening the working conditions in some countries. All that could be avoided through rational and international collaboration.

The reorganisation of the European transport system was linked with three conditions :

- 1) Common administration of the European transport material, which in the future should not be used as a means for national economic wars ;
- 2) Rational distribution and orientation of international traffic ;
- 3) Elaboration of a common equipment plan for the European transport system.

Those three conditions were closely connected with one another and could not be separated, and only in that way could the transport system be rationalised. If only a few countries would make a start, the others would follow suit. A common investment plan was perfectly feasible, and indispensable in the general interest of all concerned. The integration of the European transport system was the touchstone of the good will of the statesmen of all the OEEC countries. An attempt had already been made through the Bonnefous Plan, but it had not materialised. During the Messina Conference reference had been made to "plans" what they wanted, however, was not "plans" but one single plan, ensuring a well established, uniform and co-ordinated transport system. As regards the setting up of a European transport authority with a view to using the transport system as means for achieving greater European unification, a practicable programme in this connection had been elaborated by the British Government in 1947.

The Free Trade Union Movement would in due course demand the creation of a European transport community, this would be a true

transport community endowed with effective powers. Speaker recalled Monnet's words : "to resort to bodies without the right to take decisions amounts to a return to the past and to the times of national sovereignty". They had to realise that a true transport community signified the partial surrendering of the national sovereignty.

All integration measures taken in the field of transport would influence the other sectors of the economic and social life. They would have to face a certain amount of opposition, but that should not deter them, once they were convinced as to the necessity and usefulness of their action in that field. If the Trade Union International were ready to act, the ITF was prepared to play its part in convincing public opinion, the Governments and the Parliaments.

I. BAART (Metalworkers' Union, Netherlands) pointed out that the lack of co-ordination and rationalisation in the transport sector affected the entire economy. It would therefore be desirable for a small committee of trade union experts to be set up and instructed to elaborate a plan for the economic and social policy in the transport sector. Such a plan must embody the principle of transport freedom and the creation of a common transport market. All discriminations must be removed. The objective of their policy must be the supra-national co-ordination of the European transport means, whereby it would be indispensable to have supra-national investment and price control in order to standardise the transport tariffs of the various countries and the various means of transport.

The PREMIER proposed submitting this question to the Conference Transport Committee.

The Conference approved.

The CHAIRMAN then requested Comrade K. OSTERKAMP to introduce item No.4 on the Agenda , regarding integration of power.

K. OSTERKAMP (I.F.U.E.P.C.S.) spoke about the problem of the European integration of power, on which a written report had already been submitted to the Delegates before the Conference.

Speaker then referred to the results of the Geneva Conference on Atomic Energy. Owing to the quantities of fissionable material available to numerous countries the atomic energy industry was to-day in the hands of many nations. It was therefore essential, in order to maintain peace, to set up an international community, in which the trade unions should participate from the outset. Only then would they be able to fulfil their task which was to keep a strict eye on the development of atomic energy.

Seeing that the representatives of private enterprise claimed that the exploitation of atomic energy could only be rationally carried out by the private economy, which was, however, impossible without subventions, it was more than ever necessary for the trade unions to exercise vigilance and control. The trade unions therefore had a duty, both on the national, and particularly on the supra-national

plary, which was to insist on measures to prevent the harmful effects of radio activity, measures to prevent profit-making tendencies in the atomic industry and steps to prevent the manufacture of atom bombs.

L. ROSENBERG (DGB - Germany) likewise referred to the Geneva Conference on Atomic Energy, and drew attention to the fact that the German delegation had been the only trade union delegation at Geneva. Above all he regretted to note the absence of an ICFTU representation, which provided a further proof of the continual lack of international co-operation.

L. Rosenberg stressed the effects which atomic energy would have on all sectors of the society, and pointed out possible dangers. That was a problem of vital importance for the workers. He proposed that an Atomic Commission be set up on each national level, on the lines of those already existing in Great Britain and France. These committees would have to be endowed with the necessary powers to enable them to see to it that the production of atomic power was effected on a governmental and central basis, and not allowed to fall into private hands. On the international level an advisory committee could be created with participation of the ICFTU and the ERO. They should demand the creation of an Atomic Pool on the European level, in order to secure true and international co-operation. There should also be an Atomic Authority with proper supra-national powers, and finally the International Labour Organisation should devote special attention to protective measures in the field of atomic energy. The ratification of such measures by the individual States should be rendered compulsory.

The CHAIRMAN adjourned the meeting at 6.30 p.m.

Second Day - 26 August 1955

The second day of the session, 26th August, was devoted entirely to committee meetings, whose proposals were to be submitted by the respective rapporteurs to the Plenary Session on 27 August. In the afternoon and evening the Drafting Committee, comprising members of the three other committees, met to draw up the final draft Resolution to be submitted to the Conference.

COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES

I

General Committee

C. J. GEDDES	H. LAPAILLE
L. MURRAY	A. GRAEDEL
H. OOSTERHUIS	C. LEVINSON
H. VISSER	G. PASTORE
J. VAN WOUWE	C. VEILLON
H. UMRATH	E. DALLA CHIESA
J. VAN DER VELDEN	E. HOFHECKER
I. BAART	A. AUGARD
L. ROSENBERG	F. LAMPIN
O. BRENNER	A. FLAMENT
A. RENARD	E. WEISS
I. SMETS	G. DELAMARRE
R. LATIN	R. SCHWOB
H. JANSEN	P. TOMAS
A. BUNING	N. HAUPERT
K. HEINZ	K. OSTERKAMP
P. MAAS	A. BRAUNTHAL
Com. AUGUSTIN	

2nd Committee

T R A N S P O R T

T. YATES	H. KAHNE
G. CANINI	R. LAAN
G. DEVAUX	H. KOPPENS
G. HENDRICKS	P. SETON
A. KUMMERNUSS	O. BECU
W. HOLKESKAMP	R. DEKEYZER
A. VERMEULEN	J. CAMPBELL
K. HIRCHE	P. TOFAHN
	J. LEURS

3rd Committee

P O W E R

F. HAYDAY
C. VAN WINGERDEN
J. KRAMER
H. BUIJTER
D. FORRER
H. DUMAZET
R. DUBOIS

N. DETHIER
L. GILLON
L. CAMPION
D. COPPO
K. OSTERKAMP
E. WOLFRAM
J. GALLION
A. BRAUNPHAL

DRAFTING COMMITTEE

C. J. GEDDES
A. RENARD
D. COPPO
L. ROSENBERG
H. UMRATH
C. VEILLON

A. GRAEDEL
P. TOFAHRN
A. VERMEULEN
K. OSTERKAMP
W. SCHEVENELS

Third Day - Saturday 27 August

The CHAIRMAN opened the meeting at 11 a.m., and requested the General Secretary of the ERO to report on the work of the Committees.

W. SCHEVENELS (ERO) stated that the three Committees on finishing their work had set up a Drafting Committee, and had decided only to submit one single Declaration. They had also agreed not to issue any special Resolution, but to appeal to the National Centres to organise their propaganda themselves on the basis of this Declaration, bearing in mind the special conditions peculiar to their own countries and to undertake the necessary steps with their Governments so that the latter would act upon their claims.

The Drafting Committee had included the clauses proposed by the Transport and Power Committees without modifications. Now and again it had come up against difficulties in securing general agreement on certain clauses, but by mutually making concessions it had finally been possible to reach an agreement. W. Schevenels then read out the new text of the Declaration article by article, and hoped that the Conference would unanimously adopt it.

The Draft Declaration was approved with a few alterations and additions proposed, in particular, by the French comrade Delamarre, who in regard to Article 7, thought it should be made clear that the harmonisation of the social and economic policy should include measures to safeguard employment and working conditions.

As for Article 8, a discussion took place between the Italian comrade Dalla Chiesa (UIL) and some other delegates, particularly Comrade Möri (Switzerland) on the notion of "free mobility of manpower". E. Dalla Chiesa wished to see the trade union objective clearly defined in this respect, and considered that the absolute free mobility of manpower should be ensured, whereas J. Möri, speaking on behalf of the entire Swiss delegation, was opposed to this conception.

The Conference then formally approved the Declaration (See final text, appendix 1)

G. DELAHAYRE (FO- France, Metalworkers' Federation) asked the Conference to add to the present Declaration the following proposal :
"The ERO Conference, in consideration of the contents of Part V of the General Declaration of the Committee of XXI of the ECSC, requests the calling as early as possible of a Congress of Miners, Metalworkers and representatives of the National Centres of the ECSC countries. This Congress should determine the means of action to be used in order to achieve the objectives contained in the Messina Resolution calling for the progressive harmonisation of the social policy, priority being given to the following questions :

Reduction of working hours
Remuneration for overtime
Duration of holidays and holiday allowances (see appendix)."

L. ROSENBERG (DGB - Germany) felt that representatives of the other National Centres should also be invited to such a Conference, and not just those of the six ECSC countries.

H. OOSTERHUIS (NVV - Netherlands) suggested submitting those two proposals to the ERO Executive Committee.

A. KRIER (ECSC Liaison Office) believed that the Committee of XXI could strengthen the position of the trade unions within the ECSC. As regards social activities, the High Authority was faced with certain difficulties due to the existing Treaty. He agreed with Comrade Delamarre's draft resolution, and was also in favour of the calling of an international conference of the 6 Coal-Steel Community countries with their trade union organisations. The next session of the Committee of XXI for the Revival of the European Idea was to take place in October, when the ERO Declaration would be discussed. He added that the Committee of XXI comprised full members and observers. The British colleagues would probably participate in the Conference either as members or as observers, and the Austrian comrades as observer. The Committee was also in contact with the Scandinavian comrades, and was endeavouring to interest them in its work. Should the Committee of XXI convene a further Conference, he would not fail to invite the ICFTU and the ERO together with their affiliated organisations. With regard to a reduction of working hours to which Comrade Delamarre had referred, he pointed out that the trade unions of the Coal-Steel Community countries had already made such a claim in favour of the miners and other workers in the coal industry.

W. SCHEVENELS (ERO) thought it was possible to reconcile the two proposals of Oosterhuis and Delamarre. The date fixed for the Committee of XXI was the middle of October, and the ERO Executive Committee was to meet at the beginning of October, so that the latter could determine the attitude to be adopted by its delegates and those of the ICFTU at the Committee of XXI meeting on the question of working hours. The ICFTU and the ERO must make up their minds to launch a campaign for this purpose. This question had already been raised at the Regional Conference of the ILO, but no decisions had been arrived at.

G. DELANAIRE (FO -France) warned against giving the European workers the impression that they had made their Resolution just to shove it away into the archives. The Conference had approved a Declaration, paragraph 16 of which called for practical and positive measures. The object of that proposal was: as soon as the text had been approved, they would start acting on it.

A. GRAEDEL (U. S. S. Switzerland) believed that the Federations and National Centres concerned would have an opportunity at all times of studying the ECSC problems, in fact, it was their duty to do so.

The problem of the working hours could not be solved by formulas applicable to all countries. They could ask the National Centres to study the important question of working hours and leave it to their comrades in the ECSC to determine the practical means for co-ordinating the various policies regarding that problem. It was, however, too early to give directives. He felt that they should confine their efforts to encouraging their comrades in the ECSC to hold such a conference.

The CHAIRMAN suggested submitting the proposal in question to the Executive Committee.

The Conference agreed to this procedure

The CHAIRMAN read out a proposal from the German delegation to set up a committee on atomic energy.

L. ROSENBERG (DGB - Germany) explained the importance of setting up such a committee, as it would enable the ERO to deal currently with the question of the integration of the power sector, not only as far as the production of energy was concerned, but also in regard to the social and economic consequences connected with it. Especially within Europe was the creation of a committee of this nature of great importance. It was because of the necessity of common action that he recommended the adoption of the proposal.

W. SCHEVENELS said he agreed in principle with the German proposal, but pointed out that the ICFTU already had such a committee, which also comprised the United States and Canada. It might be possible, nevertheless, to set up a small joint committee ICFTU/ERO composed of the European technicians of the ICFTU and the ERO. He suggested leaving it to the Executive Committee to decide the way in which the German proposal should be carried out.

This proposal was adopted

The CHAIRMAN then asked the representative of the ECSC High Authority to speak.

P. FINEF, on behalf of the High Authority of the Coal-Steel Community, greeted the delegates taking part in the Conference. Having heard the criticisms regarding the inadequate activities of the ECSC in the social field, he advised the meeting not to become unduly pessimistic. They were devoting much attention to social matters, but it was not possible to go beyond Article 3 of the Treaty.

They all knew the difficulties which continued to arise due to nationalism and private interests, but it was their duty to remain optimistic and throw in all their energy towards securing greater social justice. Once the Trade Union Movement had clearly defined its objectives, they would have more prospects of overcoming opposition.

He assured the Conference that their friends in the ECSC Executive were dealing energetically with social tasks. Despite the

limitations of the Treaty clauses, and the clear-out regulations concerning the use of available funds, the High Authority was prepared to do everything in its power to improve the living standard of the workers. In conclusion he expressed the hope that the trade unions would play a dynamic part in the new economic order which was on the way.

Dr. H. POTTHOFF (Member of the High Authority) said that the revival of the European idea was not only necessary in order to further the cause of integration as such, but also in order to prevent the European Coal-Steel Community's efforts from being jeopardised. The ECSC could only be considered as a first stage towards integration, and they would not stop there. To stand still amounted to falling back, and the important thing was to create other common markets in addition to the coal and steel markets. The High Authority and the Council of Ministers felt it their duty to watch developments of coal and steel consumption as well as the general economic situation, and to bring their influence to bear in this respect.

As for the integration of transport the High Authority had contributed considerably, starting with coal and steel, to the harmonisation of European transport, by eliminating tariff discriminations. Coal and steel should not be treated in any other way than other mass produced consumer goods. As regards a European transport policy, however, it would not be successful if integration measures were only carried out by six European Governments.

Referring to the integration of power, Dr. Potthoff was convinced that a coal policy without integrating the other sources of power was not sufficient.

In conclusion, speaker once again drew attention to the importance of seeing to it that the Coal-Steel Community was not alone in its integration efforts, and he thanked the Conference in advance for any resolution which would support the work of the ECSC.

W. SCHEVENELS, referring to the proposed European transport community contained in the Messina Resolution, stated that the International Transport Workers' Federation had already included this question in their Agenda for their Forthcoming European Congress of 12 and 13 September. The Transport Committee, which had met on the day before, had suggested that the ERO Executive Committee get in touch with the ITF, and convene a joint session after this Congress, at which a number of delegates from both organisations would attend so as to determine the ways and means of acting upon the suggestions contained in their Declaration and of co-ordinating their actions in that field. He presumed that all the delegates agreed to that question being submitted to the ERO Executive Committee.

As for proposals to create a standing committee on questions connected with atomic energy and traditional sources of power, he suggested that these should likewise be left to the Executive Committee to deal with.

As regards their relations with the Committee of Ministers of the Coal-Steel Community, W. Schevenels recalled that he had already referred to an interview which he had had with P. H. Spaak, President of the Committee of Ministers, from which it had emerged that it was impossible to enable a trade union delegation or delegates appointed by the trade unions to participate in the Committee of Experts which was preparing the projects to be submitted to the Conference of Ministers in October. They would naturally continue their relations with the President of the Committee of Ministers, who had agreed to keep them currently informed of the work of the Committee of Experts in so far as such information would be published. W. Schevenels thought that a fresh talk with P.-H. Spaak was indicated, in order to submit to him the Declaration approved by the Conference, and to request him to present it to the forthcoming session of the Committee of Ministers. They could then have a frank discussion with P.-H. Spaak, and see whether it was possible to take part directly or indirectly in the work of the Study Committees. Furthermore, he had learnt that the Belgian Government which a few weeks earlier had been opposed to the inclusion of trade unionists in its national delegation, had now abandoned that negative attitude. W. Schevenels hoped that other Governments would follow the Belgian Government's example.

A. GRAEDEL (Switzerland) requested the ERO also to communicate the Declaration to the OEEC, which also played a great rôle in the economic co-operation of Europe.

W. SCHEVENELS agreed, and proposed sending the Declaration to the ECSC itself and to the Council of Europe as well.

The CHAIRMAN closed the meeting at 1.30 p.m., and thanked the delegates for their contribution to the success of the Conference. He also thanked the General Secretary and staff of the ERO for their work in connection with the Conference.

JC/EG/AR/ slc-og
28.10.55.
Original : German.

ORGANISATION REGIONALE EUROPEENNE DE LA C.I.S.L.
EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANISATION OF THE I.C.F.T.U.
EUROPAEISCHE REGIONAL-ORGANISATION DES I.B.F.G.

CONFERENCE SYNDICALE POUR LA RELANCE EUROPEENNE
TRADE UNION CONFERENCE FOR THE REVIVAL OF THE EUROPEAN IDEA
ERKSCHAFTSKONFERENZ FÜR DIE WIEDERBELEBUNG DES EUROPAGEDANKENS

Bruxelles, 25-27 août 1955

Liste de présence
List of attendance
Anwesenheitsliste

President : C.J. GEDDES

Secrétaire Général : W. SCHEVENELS

A. Centrales nationales-National Centres-Landeszentralen.

ALLEMAGNE	W.FREITAG	A.KARL	H. GREVE
GERMANY	L.ROSENBERG	O.BRENNER	H. IMIG
DEUTSCHLAND	H.BÖHM	A.KUMMERNUSS	W. BOCK
		H.SEEGER	K. HIRCHE
AUTRICHE			
AUSTRIA	E.HOFECKER		
ÖSTERREICH			
BELGIQUE	A.RENARD	R.DEKEYZER	D.VELDEKENS
BELGIUM	N.DE BOCK	G.HENDRICKX	L.CAMPION
BELGIEN	R.LATIN	H.JANSEN	H.LAPAILLE
	A.BAYENS	A.VALKENEERS	J.TAMIGNIAUX
ESPACE			
SPAIN	P. TOMAS		
SPANIEN			
FRANCE			
FRANKREICH	C. VEILLON		
GRANDE-BRETAGNE	C.J.GEDDES	L.MURRAY	
GREAT BRITAIN	T. YATES	F.HAYDAY	
GROSSBRITANNIEN			
ITALIE (CISL)	G. PASTORE	D. COPPO	
ITALY	G. CANINI	M. MARI	
ITALIEN (UIL)	E.DALLA CHIESA		

LUXEMBOURG	N. HAUPERT	J. LEURS	
LUXEMBURG	J. GALLION		
NORVEGE			
NORWAY	K. NORDAHL		
NORWEGEN			
PAYS-BAS	H. OOSTERHUIS	J.G.VAN WOUWE	H.W. KOEPENS
NETHERLANDS	C.W.VAN WINGERDEN	J.VAN DER VELDEN	R. LAAN, Jr.
HOLLAND	A. VERMEULEN	J.J. KRAMER	P.W. SETON
	H.VISSER	H.J. KANNE	H. UMRATH
	D. FORRER		
SARRE	R. RAUCH	(K. HEINZ	
		(P. MAAS	
SUISSE	J. MÜRI	(Pol.AUGUSTIN	
SWITZERLAND	A. GRÄDEL		
SCHWEIZ			
BASQUES	excusé - excused - entschuldigt		
DANEMARK	"	"	
DENMARK	"	"	
GRECE	"	"	
GREECE	"	"	
GRIECHENLAND	"	"	
ISLANDE	"	"	
ICELAND	"	"	
MALTE	"	"	
MALTA	"	"	
SUEDE			
SWEDEN			
SCHWEDEN (LO)	"	"	
(TCO)	"	"	
TRIESTE	"	"	

B. S.P.I. - I.T.S. - I.B.S.

Fédération internationale des Travailleurs du Bâtiment et du Bois
International Federation of Building and Woodworkers
Internationaler Bund der Bau- und Holzarbeiter

I. SMETS

Fédération Internationale des Employés et Techniciens
International Federation of Commercial, Clerical and Technical
Employees
Internationaler Bund der Privatangestellten

W. SPIEKMAN

Fédération Internationale des Mineurs
Miners' International Federation
Internationaler Bergarbeiterverband

N. DETHIER

Fédération Internationale des Syndicats de Fonctionnaires et du
Personnel des Services publics
International Federation of Unions of Employees in Public and Civil
Services
Internationale Föderation der Gewerkschaften des Personals
Öffentlicher Dienste

K. OSTERKAMP

R. DUBOIS

Fédération Internationale des Ouvriers du Transport
International Transport Workers' Federation
Internationale Transportarbeiter-Föderation

O. BECU

F. TOFAHRN

J. CAMPBELL

R. DEKEYZER

G. DEVAUX

Fédération Internationale des Ouvriers sur Métaux
International Metalworkers' Federation
Internationaler Metallarbeiter-Bund

A. GRADEL

C. LEVINSON

Fédération Internationale des Organisations Syndicales de Travailleurs
des Industries Diverses
International Federation of Industrial Organisations and General
Workers' Unions
Internationale Föderation von Industriegewerkschaften und
Fabrikarbeiterverbänden

A.A. BÜNING

C. Comité syndical des XXI (C.E.C.A.)
Trade Union Committee of XXI (E.C.S.C.)
Gewerkschaftlicher Ausschuss der XXI (E.G.K.S.)

ALLEMAGNE	Métallurgistes	O. BRENNER	H. BRÜMMER
GERMANY	Metalworkers	W. PETERSEN	A. HÖLKBESKAE
DEUTSCHLAND	Metallarbeiter	K. BRANDEL	
	Mineurs	K. HÖFNER	E. KADOW
	Miners	F. DAHLMANN	K. MARQUARDT
	Grubenarbeiter	M. FREY	E. WOLFRAM
BELGIQUE	Métallurgistes		
BELGIUM	Metalworkers	R. LATIN	
BELGIEN	Metallarbeiter		
	Mineurs	L. GILLON	
	Miners	O. STIEMAN	
	Grubenarbeiter		
FRANCE	Métallurgistes	G.D. DELAMARRE	
FRANKREICH	Metalworkers	P. SCHNOB.	
	Metallarbeiter		
	Mineurs	A. AUGARD	F. LAMPIN
	Miners	H. DUMAZET	A. FLAMENT
	Grubenarbeiter		
ITALIE			
ITALY	C.I.S.L.	D. COPPO	
ITALIEN			
PAYS-BAS	Métallurgistes	I. BAART	
NETHERLANDS	Metalworkers	H.G. BUTER	
HOLLAND	Metallarbeiter		
	N.V.V.	C.W. VAN WINGERDEN	

D. Bureau de Liaison - C.E.C.A.
Liaison Office - E.C.S.C.
Verbindungsbüro - Montanunion.

A. KRIER
E. WEISS
Mme Lily KRIER-BECKER

E. C.I.S.L. - I.C.F.T.U. - I.B.F.G.

J.H. OLDENBROEK
A. BRAUNTHAL
S. NEDZYNSKI

F. Invités - Guests - Gäste

C.E.C.A.	P. FINEY	
E.C.S.C.	H. POTHOFF	
E.G.K.S.	E. MASSACESI	
Conseil de l'Europe Council of Europe Europarat	N. BORCH-JACOBSEN	
O.E.C.E. O.E.E.C.	E. KIRSCHEN	
A.E.P. E.P.A.	E. HAUERSLEV	
B.I.T. I.L.O. I.A.A.	J. FAUCHAMPS	
Attachés sociaux Social Attaches Sozial Attaches	Allemagne Germany Deutschland	L. DIEDERICH
	Grande Bretagne Great Britain Grossbritannien	E. BARBER
	Pays-Bas Netherlands Holland	R.J. VAN GRONINGEN
	U.S.A.	O. PETERSON P. SAKWA (assistant) (mitarbeiter)

11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

slc
14.10.55

EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANISATION

of the

I.C.F.T.U.

TRADE UNION CONFERENCE

FOR THE REVIVAL OF THE EUROPEAN IDEA

Brussels, 25-27 August, 1955

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY G. DELAMARRE, DELEGATE OF THE
METALWORKERS, P.O., FRANCE, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY
THE CONFERENCE AND FORWARDED TO THE E.R.O. EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE FOR ACTION

The E.R.O. Conference, in pursuance of Part V of its
General Resolution, requests the Committee of XXI to convene as
soon as possible a Congress of Miners, Metalworkers and National
Centres of the six ECSC member countries.

This Congress should determine the means of action to be
taken in order to achieve the social objectives contained in the
Messina Resolution urging the progressive harmonisation of the
social policies and to give priority to the following questions :

- Reduction of the working time
 - Payment for extra performance
 - Duration and remuneration of holidays.
-

ERO/Sp.Cnf.55/2 - Final

Appendix III

EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANISATION

of the

I.C.F.T.U.

TRADE UNION CONFERENCE FOR THE REVIVAL OF THE EUROPEAN IDEA

Brussels, 25-27 August 1955

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE DELEGATION OF THE D.G.B.,
GERMANY, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE CONFERENCE AND
FORWARDED TO THE ERO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR ACTION

In view of the considerable importance of atomic
energy in economic expansion and its consequences for the
workers and for the population in general, the E.R.O. has
decided to create a Standing Committee on Atomic Energy.

ERO/Sp.Cnf.55/2-Final

Appendix IV.

EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANISATION

of the

I.C.F.T.U.

TRADE UNION CONFERENCE

FOR THE REVIVAL OF THE EUROPEAN IDEA

Brussels, 25 - 27 August 1955.

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE TRANSPORT COMMISSION,
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE CONFERENCE AND FORWARDED
TO THE E.R.O. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR ACTION.

In view of the importance of the problem of traditional energy and of the European integration proposals now being considered by the Ministerial Committee of the E.C.S.C. (Messina Resolution), it has been proposed to create a Study Committee in which the European trade union organisations most concerned will participate by sending experts.

EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANISATION

of the

I.C.F.T.U.

TRADE UNION CONFERENCE

FOR THE REVIVAL OF THE EUROPEAN IDEA

Brussels, 25 - 27 August 1955

STATEMENT ON THE REVIVAL OF THE EUROPEAN IDEA

I.

1. The necessity of raising living standards and for securing full employment in all countries is the determining reason for the free trade unions to seek European-wide solutions of the economic problems. The free trade unions demand that every step towards economic co-operation and integration should be accomplished within the framework of a policy of full employment and social progress in general, including an upward adjustment of social conditions.

2. The maximum utilisation of the economic resources of Europe, including the use of modern techniques, must serve to ensure an improvement in the conditions of the working masses and the strengthening of the economic and political status of Europe in the world. Through this also new and important possibilities will arise for bettering the standard of life of the peoples in the under-developed countries outside Europe.

3. An economic and social policy is of vital importance in each country, but in itself it is insufficient to solve Europe's pressing problems. New economic and social prospects will be opened by creating a larger market. The time has now come for Western Europe to take decisive steps towards closer economic co-operation and towards the establishment of a common market.

II.

4. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and the European Regional Organisation (ERO) have since their foundation been conscious of the prospects of a better life and a higher living standard offered by the European idea to the working masses. The ICFTU and the ERO have continuously and energetically advocated ever-widening economic co-operation and social harmonisation.

5. The European Regional Organisation of the ICFTU and its affiliated organisations, meeting in Brussels from 25 to 27 August 1955, reiterate their previous statements in favour of closer economic co-operation between the democratic countries of Europe. Recent events, particularly the Conference of

Ministers of the ECSC at Messina and certain proposals adopted by the OEEC, have given a new impetus to the European idea. With regard to the Messina Resolution, however, it is to be regretted that some important objectives contained in the Benlux memorandum were not accepted.

III.

6. The free trade unions of Europe are in favour of a progressive liberalisation of trade between as many European countries as possible, and advocate a steady and systematic reduction of tariff barriers to lead to the creation of a common market, within which the free movement of commodities will not be hampered by protectionist or other restrictive measures.

7. These liberalisation measures will have such profound repercussions on the economic structure and on the traditional trade relations of the various countries that it will be necessary during the transitional period gradually to harmonise the social and economic policies of these countries. This harmonisation will above all be aimed at preserving and even increasing the workers' possibilities of employment, as well as at eliminating all unfair competition.

8. Beside the liberalisation of trade, efforts must be made by agreements to ensure a freer movement of labour. In these agreements must be embodied social guarantees for the migrant workers as well as for the workers of the immigrant countries.

9. In order to achieve the objectives outlined in this section, the free trade unions endorse the Messina proposal for the establishment of a European investment fund. This fund would have the special duty of developing the less advanced areas of Europe.

IV.

10. The free trade unions, while in favour of closer economic and social co-operation and the integration of the complete economy of every democratic country of Europe, nevertheless recognise the benefits of projects and measures aiming at the integration of particular branches of industry, even when they initially embrace only certain countries.

11. With this in mind, the free trade unions point out that the traditional organisations and methods of international co-operation in the field of transport have proved that they cannot solve the economic problems arising in this sphere. The time is therefore ripe to establish a European authority instructed to organise transport on the basis of a plan designed to provide Europe with an efficient, adequate, economical and properly integrated transport system.

12. Another field in which integration could and should make an immediate advance is the supply and distribution of energy.

13. In seeking solutions to the problems closely connected with such partial integrations, advantage should be taken of the experience with the ECSC. If several such communities are set up in Europe, measures are to be taken to ensure their close co-operation, unless a co-ordinating body is created to that effect.

14. The recent discoveries in the field of atomic energy and of its utilisation for peaceful aims will open new prospects for economic progress. European countries must co-operate closely in the task of building this new industry with a view to basing this undertaking on a common plan serving the whole community of democratic Europe. The free trade unions of the ERO demand an effective control over atomic production and unreservedly endorse the Declaration of the ICFTU Conference held in Brussels on 1st and 2nd August 1955, defining in detail the conditions under which such control must be organised. They also approve the Resolution on this matter taken at Messina, where a common organisation was envisaged for several States ensuring the peaceful development of atomic energy, and note the four clauses designed to bring this about (see text attached). In view of the importance which these developments will have upon industry and upon the workers, the production of atomic energy should in no case be left in the hands of private interests.

V.

15. The ERO and its affiliated organisations welcome the recognition made by the Messina Resolution of the need for the progressive harmonisation of social conditions in different countries and declare that this recognition must be followed by practical measures leading progressively to the upward adjustment.

16. However, taking account of the experience of the ECSC and the difficulties encountered by the High Authority in its social action owing to the fact that the Treaty clauses in this connection are too vague or restrictive, the ERO insists that in future formal and explicit guarantees be included in any treaty creating a new European community, or in the ECSC Treaty when revised, rendering the harmonisation measures and social progress promised by the Messina Resolution compulsory. It recommends its affiliated organisation to define the common action they intend to take in due course on the international level, in order to put the spirit of solidarity, which unites the European workers, in concrete form.

VI.

17. It is of decisive importance that the workers are fully aware of the issues at stake and become staunch supporters of the European idea. The free trade unions consider that the workers should throw all their strength into this struggle for economic and social co-operation. The ERO calls on the National Centres to strengthen and to spread systematically the European idea through constant propaganda, and in particular among their own members, so that influence may be brought to bear through this steadily increasing force upon hesitant and reluctant Governments and so that continuous progress is guaranteed towards a closer unity in Europe.

18. The Messina proposals, like all the initiatives for European co-operation and integration, can only be successful if they are supported by the workers. This support can only be secured if the European workers through their organisations are partners in all negotiations bearing on the success of such plans

and are adequately represented to a greater extent in all steering, administrative and consultative bodies in charge of the putting into effect of these projects.

19. The ERO and its affiliated organisations call on the free workers of Europe to enter upon this campaign with all their strength, in order that they may achieve these objectives.

Appendixes.

Conf./jc/ar. 29.9.55.
Orig. French.

A P P E N D I X I.

The four Clauses of the Messina Resolution relative to
Atomic Energy

The six signatory States consider that the creation of a common organisation should be examined, to have the responsibility and the means of ensuring the peaceful development of atomic energy, taking into consideration special arrangements arrived at by certain Governments with third parties.

These means consist of : -

- a) the establishment of a common fund composed of contributions from each of the participating countries, which would enable the financing of installations and research now under way or to be undertaken in future ;
 - b) free and adequate access to raw materials, free exchange of knowledge and technicians, by-products and specialised machinery ;
 - c) the making available, without discrimination, of the results obtained and the granting of financial assistance for the application of those results ;
 - d) co-operation with non-member countries.
-